

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview

1. **Date of Submission:** 2011-01-19

2. **Agency:** 011

3. **Bureau:** 10

4. **Name of this Investment:** FBI Law Enforcement Online (LEO)

5. **Unique Project (Investment) Identifier (UPI):** 011-10-02-00-01-2016-00

6. **What kind of investment will this be in FY 2012?:** Mixed Life Cycle

- Planning
- Full Acquisition
- Operations and Maintenance
- Mixed Life Cycle
- Multi-Agency Collaboration

7. **What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?** FY2006

8.

- a. **Provide a brief summary of the investment and justification, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap, specific accomplishments expected by the budget year and the related benefit to the mission, and the primary beneficiary(ies) of the investment.**

The LEO is a global virtual private network provided by the FBI to all levels of the law enforcement, criminal justice, and public safety communities and is an "anytime and anywhere" system for secure dissemination of Sensitive But Unclassified/Controlled Unclassified Information. The LEO system provides to its membership, free of charge, a state-of-the-practice secure internet based communications network. Accordingly, the LEO is used to support investigative operations, send notifications and alerts, and provide an avenue to remotely access a wide variety of law enforcement and intelligence systems and resources. The LEO Virtual Command Centers (VCCs) are an important situational awareness mechanism and crisis management tool, providing support for special events, training exercises, crisis situations, and natural disasters. The VCCs are used as a collaborative communication mechanism to provide Intelligence products and a wide range of reference materials appropriate to the event and/or venue and can be utilized and/or reviewed by authorized members from multiple, geographically dispersed locations. The LEO is the cornerstone of the Department of Justice (DOJ) and FBI Information Sharing Initiatives. Its network provides a vehicle for all levels of law enforcement and criminal justice communities to share and exchange information, conduct on-line education programs, and participate in professional special interest and topically focused dialogue, thereby providing information capabilities which ultimately supports the President's Management Agenda of Expanded Electronic Government; DOJ Strategic Plans of "Prevent Terrorism and Promote the Nation's Security"; "Prevent Crime, Enforce Federal Laws and Represent the Rights and Interests of the American People"; and "Ensure the Fair and Efficient Administration of Justice"; and the FBI's Strategic Goal to "Provide timely and relevant criminal justice services to authorized law enforcement, criminal justice, civilian, academic, employment, and licensing agencies".

- b. **Provide any links to relevant websites that would be useful to gain additional information on the investment including links to GAO and IG reports.**

Title	Link
NONE	

9.

- a. **Provide the date of the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approval of this investment.**
2010-06-02
- b. **Provide the date of the most recent or planned approved project charter.** 2006-06-06

10. **Contact information?**

- a. **Program/Project Manager Name:** *
Phone Number: *
Email: *
- b. **Business Function Owner Name (i.e. Executive Agent or Investment Owner):** Robery J. Casey
Phone Number: *
Email: *

11. **What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (choose only one per FAC-P/PM or DAWIA):** Project manager has been validated according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria as qualified for this investment.

- Project manager has been validated according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria as qualified for this investment.
- Project manager qualifications according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria is under review for this investment.
- Project manager assigned to investment, but does not meet requirements according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria.
- Project manager assigned but qualification status review has not yet started.
- No project manager has yet been assigned to this investment.

Section B: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.B.1: Summary of Funding
(In millions of dollars)

(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2010	CY 2011 (CY Continuing Resolution)	BY 2012	BY+1 2013	BY+2 2014	BY+3 2015	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Acquisition:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Planning & Acquisition Government FTE Costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition(DME):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Operations & Maintenance:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Disposition Costs (optional):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Operations, Maintenance, Disposition Government FTE Costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Subtotal O&M and Disposition Costs (SS):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL FTE Costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL (not including FTE costs):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL (including FTE costs):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Number of FTE represented by	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Table I.B.1: Summary of Funding
(In millions of dollars)

(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2010	CY 2011 (CY Continuing Resolution)	BY 2012	BY+1 2013	BY+2 2014	BY+3 2015	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Costs:									

2. Insert the number of years covered in the column “PY-1 and earlier”: 9

3. Insert the number of years covered in the column “BY+4 and beyond”: *

4. If the summary of funding has changed from the FY 2011 President’s Budget request, briefly explain those changes:

*

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.C.1 Contracts Table

Contract Status	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID)	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID	Solicitation ID	Alternative financing	EVM Required	Ultimate Contract Value (M)	Type of Contract/Task Order (Pricing)	Is the contract a Performance Based Service Acquisition (PBSA)?	Effective date	Actual or expected End Date of Contract/Task Order	Extent Competed	Short description of acquisition
Awarded		DJFM7D701300	W91QUZ04D00004		*	*	\$0.2	Cost Plus Incentive	N	2005-10-01	2011-09-30	Full and Open Competition	SoMASP HW/SW Maint. Agreement which supports multiple CJIS investments
Awarded		DJFA6D605600	V797049A3GP070		*	*	\$0.5	Firm Fixed Price	N	2005-10-19	2006-09-30	N	CLIN AA02 O&M MANAGEMENT SERV
Awarded		InteragencyAgreemnt			*	*	\$0.0	Time and Materials	N	2010-08-01	2011-07-31	Not Competed	Louisiana State University Cooperative Agreement

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

*

3.

a. Has an Acquisition Plan been developed? If yes, please answer the questions that follow *

- b. Does the Acquisition Plan reflect the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 *
- c. Was the Acquisition Plan approved in accordance with agency requirements *
- d. If "yes," enter the date of approval? *
- e. Is the acquisition plan consistent with your agency Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan? *
- f. Does the acquisition plan meet the requirements of EOs 13423 and 13514? *
- g. If an Acquisition Plan has not been developed, provide a brief explanation.

*

Part II: IT Capital Investments

Section A: General

1.
 - a. **Confirm that the IT Program/Project manager has the following competencies: configuration management, data management, information management, information resources strategy and planning, information systems/network security, IT architecture, IT performance assessment, infrastructure design, systems integration, systems life cycle, technology awareness, and capital planning and investment control.** yes
 - b. **If not, confirm that the PM has a development plan to achieve competencies either by direct experience or education.**
2. **Describe the progress of evaluating cloud computing alternatives for service delivery to support this investment.** DOJ will include cloud computing (CC) capabilities in its infrastructure when they are mature enough to support DOJ missions and security requirements. Its CC strategy will define a service approach for implementing CC capabilities across DOJ.
3. **Provide the date of the most recent or planned Quality Assurance Plan** 2010-09-30
4.
 - a. **Provide the UPI of all other investments that have a significant dependency on the successful implementation of this investment.**
 - b. **If this investment is significantly dependent on the successful implementation of another investment(s), please provide the UPI(s).**
5. **An Alternatives Analysis must be conducted for all Major Investments with Planning and Acquisition (DME) activities and evaluate the costs and benefits of at least three alternatives and the status quo. The details of the analysis must be available to OMB upon request. Provide the date of the most recent or planned alternatives analysis for this investment.** 2010-12-13
6. **Risks must be actively managed throughout the lifecycle of the investment. The Risk Management Plan and risk register must be available to OMB upon request. Provide the date that the risk register was last updated.** 2009-03-31

Section B: Cost and Schedule Performance

Table II.B.1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline:

Description of Activity	DME or SS	Agency EA Transition Plan Milestone Identifier	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
FBI LEO 1.12 - Project Management, ORNL	DME	*	\$0.8	\$0.8	2004-11-01	2004-11-01	2006-09-01	2007-02-28	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO 1.1 - Project Initiation, Analysis, and Review	DME	*	\$0.1	\$0.1	2004-11-01	2004-11-01	2005-05-20	2005-05-20	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO O&M (Steady State) (FY 2003 and Earlier)	SS	*	\$49.9	\$49.9	2000-10-01	2000-10-01	2003-09-30	2003-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO System Hardware and Software (FY 2008 and Earlier)	DME	*	\$32.5	\$32.5	2000-10-01	2000-10-01	2008-09-29	2008-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO Program Office Support Services	DME	*	*	*	2012-10-01	*	2013-09-29	*	*	*
FBI LEO Enterprise Architecture Planning Support (LEO's Portion of CJIS Div.)	DME	*	\$0.7	\$0.5	2010-10-01	2010-10-01	2011-09-29		75.00%	75.00%
FBI LEO TECH REFRESH 1.5 - Operational Readiness Review (ORR) Preparation	DME	*	\$0.0	\$0.0	2009-06-01		2011-06-30		0.00%	0.00%
FBI LEO Program Office Support Services (FY 2008 and Earlier)	DME	*	\$11.7	\$11.7	2000-10-01	2000-10-01	2008-09-29	2008-09-30	100.00%	100.00%

Table II.B.1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline:

Description of Activity	DME or SS	Agency EA Transition Plan Milestone Identifier	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
FBI LEO Enterprise Architecture Planning Support (LEO's Portion of CJIS Div.) (FY 2008 and Earlier)	DME	*	\$1.0	\$1.0	2000-10-01	2000-10-01	2008-09-29	2008-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO Enterprise Architecture Planning Support (LEO's Portion of CJIS Div.)	DME	*	*	*	2013-10-01	*	2014-09-29	*	*	*
FBI LEO TECH REFRESH 1.3 - System Design Specification and Development	DME	*	\$0.4	\$0.4	2009-06-01	2009-06-01	2011-06-30	2010-10-21	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO O&M (Steady State)	SS	*	\$16.0	\$16.0	2007-10-01	2007-10-01	2008-09-30	2008-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO 1.4 - System Design Specification	DME	*	\$1.4	\$1.1	2004-11-01	2004-11-01	2006-05-01	2006-05-01	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO O&M (Steady State)	SS	*	\$15.7	\$15.7	2004-10-01	2004-10-01	2005-09-30	2005-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO Enterprise Architecture Planning Support (LEO's Portion of CJIS Div.)	DME	*	*	*	2014-10-01	*	2015-09-29	*	*	*
FBI LEO TECH REFRESH 1.9 - Hardware	DME	*	\$4.4	\$4.4	2009-12-18	2009-12-15	2010-05-15	2010-03-16	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO Program Office Support Services	DME	*	\$0.1	\$0.1	2009-10-01	2009-10-01	2010-09-29	2010-09-29	100.00%	100.00%

Table II.B.1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline:

Description of Activity	DME or SS	Agency EA Transition Plan Milestone Identifier	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
FBI LEO O&M (Steady State)	SS	*	\$22.0	\$20.1	2009-10-01	2009-10-01	2010-09-29		92.00%	92.00%
FBI LEO Program Office Support Services	DME	*	\$0.4	\$0.4	2008-10-01	2008-10-01	2009-09-29	2009-06-30	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO Enterprise Architecture Planning Support (LEO's Portion of CJIS Div.)	DME	*	\$0.8	\$0.8	2008-10-01	2008-10-01	2009-09-29	2009-06-30	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO 1.7 - System Tests	DME	*	\$0.3	\$0.3	2004-11-01	2004-11-01	2006-06-14	2006-12-01	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO 1.6 - Test Readiness Review (TRR) Preparation	DME	*	\$0.5	\$0.5	2004-11-01	2004-11-01	2006-08-08	2006-12-01	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO O&M (Steady State)	SS	*	\$10.9	\$10.9	2003-10-01	2003-10-01	2004-09-30	2004-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO O&M (Steady State)	SS	*	*	*	2014-10-01	*	2015-09-29	*	*	*
FBI LEO Program Office Support Services	DME	*	*	*	2013-10-01	*	2014-09-29	*	*	*
FBI LEO Enterprise Architecture Planning Support (LEO's Portion of CJIS Div.)	DME	*	\$0.7	\$0.0	2011-10-01		2012-09-29		0.00%	0.00%
FBI LEO Enterprise Architecture Planning Support (LEO's Portion of CJIS Div.)	DME	*	\$0.8	\$0.8	2009-10-01	2009-10-01	2010-09-29	2010-09-29	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO O&M	SS	*	\$2.1	\$2.1	2005-10-01	2005-10-01	2006-09-30	2006-09-30	100.00%	100.00%

Table II.B.1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline:

Description of Activity	DME or SS	Agency EA Transition Plan Milestone Identifier	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
(Steady State)										
FBI LEO O&M (Steady State)	SS	*	\$6.3	\$5.6	2004-11-04	2004-11-04	2005-09-29	2005-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO 1.5 - System Development Implementation	DME	*	\$1.7	\$2.3	2004-11-01	2004-11-01	2006-05-05	2007-02-19	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO TECH REFRESH 1.8 - Project Management	DME	*	\$0.2	\$0.1	2009-06-01	2009-06-01	2011-06-30		90.00%	90.00%
FBI LEO TECH REFRESH 1.2 - Requirements Analysis	DME	*	\$0.0	\$0.0	2009-06-01	2009-06-01	2011-06-30	2010-09-08	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO O&M (Steady State)	SS	*	\$24.0	\$24.0	2008-10-01	2008-10-01	2009-09-29	2009-09-29	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO O&M (Steady State)	SS	*	\$16.9	\$16.9	2006-10-01	2006-10-01	2007-09-30	2007-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO 1.8 - Operational Readiness Review (ORR) Preparation	DME	*	\$0.2	\$0.1	2004-11-01	2004-11-01	2006-08-31	2007-02-07	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO O&M (Steady State)	SS	*	*	*	2013-10-01	*	2014-09-29	*	*	*
FBI LEO O&M (Steady State)	SS	*	*	*	2012-10-01	*	2013-09-29	*	*	*
FBI LEO TECH REFRESH 1.6 - Project Reviews Milestones, Project meetings and reporting	DME	*	\$0.1	\$0.1	2009-06-01	2009-06-01	2011-06-30		99.00%	99.00%
FBI LEO TECH REFRESH 1.4 -	DME	*	\$0.0	\$0.0	2009-06-01	2009-06-01	2011-06-30		50.00%	50.00%

Table II.B.1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline:

Description of Activity	DME or SS	Agency EA Transition Plan Milestone Identifier	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
Test Readiness Review (TRR) Preparation and perform testing										
FBI LEO TECH REFRESH 1.1 - Project Initiation, Analysis, and Review	DME	*	\$0.1	\$0.1	2009-06-01	2009-06-01	2011-06-30	2010-09-08	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO 1.11 - Engineering Change Proposals	DME	*	\$0.1	\$0.1	2004-11-01	2004-11-01	2006-08-11	2007-02-19	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO O&M (Steady State)	SS	*	\$27.5	\$0.0	2011-10-01		2012-09-29		0.00%	0.00%
FBI LEO Program Office Support Services	DME	*	\$0.0	\$0.0	2010-10-01	2010-10-01	2011-09-29		75.00%	75.00%
FBI LEO O&M (Steady State)	SS	*	\$26.5	\$11.0	2010-10-01	2010-10-01	2011-09-29		42.00%	42.00%
FBI LEO 1.10 - Project Meetings and Reporting	DME	*	\$0.4	\$0.3	2004-11-01	2004-11-01	2006-09-01	2007-02-19	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO 1.9 - Project Reviews Milestones	DME	*	\$0.2	\$0.1	2004-11-01	2004-11-01	2006-09-01	2007-02-19	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO 1.2 - Requirements Analysis	DME	*	\$0.1	\$0.1	2004-11-01	2004-11-01	2005-03-07	2005-03-07	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO Program Office Support Services	DME	*	*	*	2014-10-01	*	2015-09-29	*	*	*
FBI LEO Enterprise Architecture Planning Support (LEO's Portion of	DME	*	*	*	2012-10-01	*	2013-09-29	*	*	*

Table II.B.1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline:

Description of Activity	DME or SS	Agency EA Transition Plan Milestone Identifier	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
CJIS Div.)										
FBI LEO Program Office Support Services	DME	*	\$0.0	\$0.0	2011-10-01		2012-09-29		0.00%	0.00%
FBI LEO 1.3 - Engineering Analysis Prototyping (Analysis Reports)	DME	*	\$0.3	\$0.3	2004-11-01	2004-11-01	2005-06-08	2005-06-08	100.00%	100.00%
FBI LEO O&M (Steady State)	SS	*	*	*	2015-10-01	*	2016-09-29	*	*	*
FBI LEO Enterprise Architecture Planning Support (LEO's Portion of CJIS Div.)	DME	*	*	*	2015-10-01	*	2016-09-29	*	*	*
FBI LEO Program Office Support Services	DME	*	*	*	2015-10-01	*	2016-09-29	*	*	*
FBI LEO TECH REFRESH 1.10 - Materials	DME	*	\$2.8	\$2.8	2010-06-01	2010-06-01	2010-09-30		98.00%	98.00%

2. If the investment cost, schedule, or performance variances are not within 10 percent of the current baseline, provide a complete analysis of the reasons for the variances, the corrective actions to be taken, and the most likely estimate at completion.

3. For mixed lifecycle or operations and maintenance investments an Operational Analysis must be performed annually. Operational analysis may identify the need to redesign or modify an asset by identifying previously undetected faults in design, construction, or installation/integration, highlighting whether actual operation and maintenance costs vary significantly from budgeted costs, or documenting that the asset is failing to meet program requirements. The details of the analysis must be available to OMB upon request. Insert the date of the most recent or planned operational analysis.
2010-11-01

4. Did the Operational analysis cover all 4 areas of analysis: Customer Results, Strategic and Business Results, Financial Performance, and Innovation?

no

Section C: Financial Management Systems

Table II.C.1: Financial Management Systems			
System(s) Name	System acronym	Type of Financial System	BY Funding

*

*

*

*

Section D: Multi-Agency Collaboration Oversight (For Multi-Agency Collaborations only)

Table II.D.1. Customer Table:	
Customer Agency	Joint exhibit approval date
NONE	

Table II.D.2. Shared Service Providers		
Shared Service Provider (Agency)	Shared Service Asset Title	Shared Service Provider Exhibit 53 UPI (BY 2011)
*	*	*

Table II.D.3. For IT Investments, Partner Funding Strategies (\$millions):							
Partner Agency	Partner exhibit 53 UPI (BY 2012)	CY Monetary Contribution	CY “In-Kind” Contribution	CY Fee-for-Service	BY Monetary Contribution	BY “In-Kind” Contribution	BY Fee-for-Service
NONE							

Table II.D.4. Legacy Systems Being Replaced		
Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	Current UPI	Date of the System Retirement
*	*	*

Section E: Performance Information

Table I.E.1a. Performance Metric Attributes

Measurement Area (For IT Assets)	Measurement Grouping (For IT Assets)	Measurement Indicator	Reporting Frequency	Unit of Measure	Performance Measure Direction	Baseline	Year Baseline Established for this measure (Origination Date)
Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average Percent of Monthly Resolution (Help Desk)	annual	Percentage of 1st call Resolutions	Up	0.97	2010-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2014	98% or greater		Not Due	2011-02-23
			2015	98% or greater		Not Due	2011-02-23
			2016	98% or greater		Not Due	2011-02-23
Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average Percent of Monthly Resolutions (Help Desk)	annual	Percentage of 1st call Resolutions	Up	0.97	2005-07-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2006	99% or greater	0.99	Met	2011-02-23
Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average Percent of Monthly Resolutions (Help Desk)	annual	Percentage of 1st call Resolutions	Up	0.97	2006-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2007	99% or greater	0.97	Not Met	2011-02-23
Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average Percent of	annual	Percentage of 1st call	Up	0.97	2010-08-01

		Monthly Resolutions (Help Desk)		Resolutions			
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2010	98% or greater	98	Met	2011-02-18
Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average Percent of Monthly Resolutions (Help Desk)	annual	Percentage of 1st call Resolutions	Up	0.97	2007-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2008	99% or greater	0.97	Not Met	2011-02-23
			2009	99% or greater	0.985	Not Met	2011-02-23
Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Average Percent of Monthly Resolutions (Help Desk)	annual	Percentage of 1st call Resolutions	Up	0.97	2010-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2011	98% or greater		Not Due	2011-02-23
			2012	98% or greater		Not Due	2011-02-23
			2013	98% or greater		Not Due	2011-02-23
Technology	Availability	System Availability	annual	Percentage of time available	Up	0.99	2005-07-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2006	99% or greater	0.99	Met	2011-02-23

Technology	Availability	System Availability	annual	Percentage of time available	Up	0.99	2006-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2007	99% or greater	0.99	Met	2011-02-23
Technology	Availability	System Availability	annual	Percentage of time available	Up	0.99	2007-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2008	99% or greater	0.99	Met	2011-02-23
			2009	99% or greater	0.99	Met	2011-02-23
Technology	Availability	System Availability	annual	Percentage of time available	Up	0.99	2010-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2014	99% or greater		Not Due	2011-02-23
			2015	99% or greater		Not Due	2011-02-23
			2016	99% or greater		Not Due	2011-02-23
Technology	Availability	System Availability	annual	Percentage of time available	Up	0.99	2010-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2010	99% or greater	99	Met	2011-02-18
Technology	Availability	System Availability	annual	Percentage of time	Up	0.99	2010-08-01

				available			
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2011	99% or greater		Not Due	2011-02-23
			2012	99% or greater		Not Due	2011-02-23
			2013	99% or greater		Not Due	2011-02-23
Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	System Transactions (Content Posted)	annual	Number of documents Posted to system	Up	27500	2005-07-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2006	Increase by 27%	35500	Met	2011-02-23
Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	System Transactions (Contents Posted)	annual	Number of documents Posted to system	Up	35000	2006-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2007	Increase by 15%	40693	Met	2011-02-23
Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	System Transactions (Contents Posted)	annual	Number of documents Posted to system	Up	40250	2007-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2008	Increase by 15%	48761	Met	2011-02-23
Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	System Transactions (Contents Posted)	annual	Number of documents Posted to system	Up	46287	2007-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated

			2009	Increase by 15%	51603	Not Met	2011-02-23
Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	System Transactions (Contents Posted)	annual	Number of documents Posted to system	Up	54000	2010-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2011	Increase by 5%		Not Due	2011-02-23
Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	System Transactions (Contents Posted)	annual	Number of documents Posted to system	Up	56700	2010-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2012	Increase by 5%		Not Due	2011-02-23
Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	System Transactions (Contents Posted)	annual	Number of documents Posted to system	Up	60000	2010-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2013	Increase by 5%		Not Due	2011-02-23
Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	System Transactions (Contents Posted)	annual	Number of documents Posted to system	Up	63000	2010-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2014	Increase by 5%		Not Due	2011-02-23
Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	System Transactions (Contents Posted)	annual	Number of documents Posted to system	Up	66150	2010-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2015	Increase by 5%		Not Due	2011-02-23

Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	System Transactions (Contents Posted)	annual	Number of documents Posted to system	Up	70000	2010-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2016	Increase by 5%		Not Due	2011-02-23
Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	System Transactions (Contents Posted)	annual	Number of documents Posted to system	Up	51500	2010-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2010	Increase by 5%	54545	Met	2011-02-18
Mission and Business Results	Citizen Protection	System User Increase	annual	Number of vetted members	Up	43800	2005-07-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2006	Increase by 14%	51200	Met	2011-02-23
Mission and Business Results	Citizen Protection	System User Increase	annual	Number of vetted members	Up	50000	2006-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2007	Increase by 100%	99966	Not Met	2011-02-23
Mission and Business Results	Citizen Protection	System User Increase	annual	Number of vetted members	Up	100000	2007-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2008	Increase by 10%	120253	Met	2011-02-23

Mission and Business Results	Citizen Protection	System User Increase	annual	Number of vetted members	Up	110000	2007-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2009	Increase by 36%	145163	Not Met	2011-02-23
Mission and Business Results	Citizen Protection	System User Increase	annual	Number of vetted members	Up	174000	2010-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2011	Increase by 10%		Not Due	2011-02-23
Mission and Business Results	Citizen Protection	System User Increase	annual	Number of vetted members	Up	191500	2010-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2012	Increase by 10%		Not Due	2011-02-23
Mission and Business Results	Citizen Protection	System User Increase	annual	Number of vetted members	Up	210500	2010-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2013	Increase by 10%		Not Due	2011-02-23
Mission and Business Results	Citizen Protection	System User Increase	annual	Number of vetted members	Up	231500	2010-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2014	Increase by 10%		Not Due	2011-02-23

Mission and Business Results	Citizen Protection	System User Increase	annual	Number of vetted members	Up	145000	2010-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2010	Increase by 20%	172398	Not Met	2011-02-23
Mission and Business Results	Citizen Protection	System User Increase	annual	Number of vetted members	Up	254500	2010-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2015	Increase by 10%		Not Due	2011-02-23
Mission and Business Results	Citizen Protection	System User Increase	annual	Number of vetted members	Up	280000	2010-08-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2016	Increase by 10%		Not Due	2011-02-23

* - Indicates data is redacted.